

Remarks

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Examiner rejects claims 18-22, 25-28 and 30-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakkinen in view of Krishnamurthi. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 18, as amended, clarifies that the radio link configuration change message defines a new meaning for a Transport Format Set. The Transport Format Set represents a combination of radio link configuration parameters that can be used on the radio links. In telecommunication systems it is important to distinguish bearer related configurations and call based configurations. In the present case the amended claim indicates that a transport format set is claimed, i.e. relating to bearer capabilities rather than to an in-call configuration change. In wireless systems the bearer is represented effectively by the wireless channels across the air interface.

The base station/mobile unit selects from the set to thereby allow a receiver to correctly demultiplex the received signal. There is a need, from time to time, to change the meaning of a transport format set to cope with changes in the system. When the set is changed, it is important that all network elements (mobiles and base stations) are aware of the correct new meaning of the set. Claim 18 requires that after changing the meaning of a set, the system waits for an acknowledgement from at least one base station transceiver in transmitting communication with the mobile terminal, at least one base station transceiver in receiving communication with the mobile terminal and the mobile terminal before using the new meaning of the set.

Turning now to the references relied upon by the Examiner, the teaching of Hakkinen is restricted to the establishment of a new connection between a mobile and a set of base stations. Hakkinen fails to disclose the sending of a radio link configuration change message, particularly one of the form now

recited in claim 18. Indeed, Hakkinen is silent as to any signalling which occurs other than at the establishment of a connection.

Applicant agrees with Examiner's reasoning that Hakkinen fails to teach a set of common radio link configuration parameters.

Krishnamurthi describes the sending of a 'service configuration directive' and gives the example of accommodating a voice call and an SMS message. Krishnamurthi provides no detail of how the service configuration is signalled to a terminal and Krishnamurthi does not teach the use of an a combination of radio link configuration parameters at the bearer level. The use of a transport format set, as recited in claim 18 of the present application, has a significant advantage of reducing the amount of signalling information that needs to be communicated between parties on a call-by-call basis as the basic allowed transport formats are already predefined.

Krishnamurthi relates to allowing a new call in addition to an existing call. This is an in-call change and applies only to the relevant mobile unit. On the other hand the claimed invention relates to changing the meaning of a set of transport formats. By doing this in advance of any call, the present invention allows a rapid change of call type without the in-call negotiation required by Krishnamurthi.

Krishnamurthi does not teach a way of defining a new meaning for such a transport format set in the manner recited in amended claim 18 or of waiting before using the new meaning of the transport format set until an acknowledgement has been received from at least one base station transceiver in transmitting communication with the mobile terminal, at least one base station transceiver in receiving communication with the mobile terminal and the mobile terminal.

In view of the above, even if one of ordinary skill were to combine Hakkinen and Krishnamurthi, they would not arrive at the combination of limitations recited in amended claim 18.

Independent claims 26, 32, 34 and 36 have been amended in a similar manner to claim 18 and are similarly considered allowable. Rejected claims 19-22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33 and 35 are considered allowable at least by virtue of being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 37 to 41 have been introduced to define the new meaning for the transport format set being represented by a Transport Format Combination Indicator (TFCI). The Transport Format Combination Indicator is a label which represents, in an abbreviated form, a combination of radio link configuration parameters that can be used on the radio links. A typical system will have a current set of TFCIs which each represent a particular combination of radio link configuration parameters which is allowed on the system. An indicator is included in each transmitted signal and signals, to a receiver, which combination of transport formats from the set of formats defined by the TFCI is being used. This allows the receiver to correctly demultiplex the received signal with a minimum of lost time and there is no need for in-call negotiation.

Krishnamurthi describes the sending of a 'service configuration directive' and gives the example of accommodating a voice call and an SMS message. Krishnamurthi provides no detail of how the service configuration is signalled to a terminal and Krishnamurthi does not teach the use of an indicator which represents a combination of radio link configuration parameters. The use of an indicator, as recited in new claims 37 to 41 of the present application, has a significant advantage of reducing the amount of signalling information that needs to be communicated between parties. This is described, for example, at page 11 lines 5-7 of the present application. Krishnamurthi also does not teach a way of defining a new meaning for such an indicator in the manner recited in new claims 37 to 41 or of waiting before using the new meaning of the

transport format combination indicator (TFCI) until an acknowledgement has been received from at least one base station transceiver in transmitting communication with the mobile terminal, at least one base station transceiver in receiving communication with the mobile terminal and the mobile terminal.


In view of the above, even if one of ordinary skill were to combine Hakkinen and Krishnamurthi, they would not arrive at the combination of limitations recited in new claims 37 to 41.

Examiner rejects claims 23-24 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakkinen in view of Krishnamurthi and Lee. As these claims are dependent upon either claim 18 or 26, the merits of which have been discussed above, these further claims are also considered allowable.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

December 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 (fax)